

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application..

Claims 1, 6 and 24 are hereby amended; claims 2, 8, 11, 14, 17-23 and 30 are hereby cancelled. No new matter is hereby added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-7, 10, 12, 13, 24 and 26-29 are currently pending for examination. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claim 11 which depends from claim 1, is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has canceled claim 11.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 5 Claims 1-2, 5, 10-14, 17-21, 23-24 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Fleming et al (U.S. 6,111,357, hereinafter Fleming). A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-8, 14, 17-19, 22-24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art (AAPA), further in view of Fleming et al. A

complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Fleming does not anticipate claims 1 and 10, as amended.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to positively recite a combination of features including, inter alia, "the holes in the counter electrode have a shape of a circle." (emphasis added).

Fleming does not teach or suggest at least the claim feature of holes in the counter electrode have a shape of a circle. In Fleming, as shown in Fig 6B & 6C, the holes in the counter electrode (20) have a shape of a polygon. Thus, the above-noted claim feature is clearly absent from Fleming.

The claimed invention of holes in the counter electrode have a shape of a circle is more effective in enhancing the uniformity of diffraction effect than Fleming.

In case where the counter electrode has holes of rectangular shape, this structure may cause the problem that diffraction effect of the UV light going through the holes having a rectangular shape decreases because the distances between the center of each rectangular shape and each side of the rectangular shape are different from each other. In other words, the uniformity of diffraction effect going through the holes of rectangular shape is decreased. However, if the holes of the counter electrode are formed in a circle shape, diffraction effect of the UV light going through the holes having a circle shape increases remarkably because the distances between the center of the

circle shape and arcs of the circle shape are same. In other words, the uniformity of diffraction effect going through the holes having a circle shape increases.

Accordingly, Fleming including the other references fails to teach or suggest the feature of “the holes in the counter electrode have a shape of a circle,” recited in the claim 1.

Similarly, independent claim 6 has been amended to positively recite a combination of features including, inter alia, “the holes in the counter strip have a shape of a circle” (emphasis added).

Accordingly, independent claims 1 and 6, and their dependent claims 3-5, 7, 10, 12, 13, 24 and 26-29 (due to the dependency) are patentable over the references, and reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance and therefore requests favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-2353. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Dated: June 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Donald L. Monin, Jr.

Registration No.: 47,256
Holland & Knight LLP
2099 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. – Suite 100
Washington, DC 20006-6801
(202) 419-2521 - Telephone
(202) 955-5564 - Facsimile